

Date: Wed, 14 Jul 93 22:08:50 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #229
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 14 Jul 93 Volume 93 : Issue 229

Today's Topics:

 Call sign snobbery (3 msgs)
 Comments on CW issue.
Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams) (5 msgs)
 Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams
 The Canonical list of Code-Wars Answers
 The FCC

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 14 Jul 93 22:44:18 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!cs.utexas.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!bobw@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Call sign snobbery
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dale@sequent.com (Dale Mosby) writes:

>
 <stuff deleted>
>
> Well, a couple points to all this: Don't judge a license class
> by the call sign. In fact don't pay any attention to the license
> class at all -- see if the person has something interesting to
> talk about! (need only be interesting to you)
>

Right on, Dale!

Except for the obviously superior KB0 2x2 calls. :-)

Bob, KB0CY

"I absolutely hate people who are intolerant."

Date: Wed, 14 Jul 93 20:13:35 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
darwin.sura.net!news-feed-2.peachnet.edu!umn.edu!gaia.ucs.orst.edu!sequent!
muncher.sequent.com!dale@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Call sign snobbery
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Well, interesting to see that the code/no-code flamage has also moved into concerns over call signs. Nxxxx, Kxxxx, Wxxxx, what is best and what shows that you are just one of those no-good.....

My wife upgraded to Technician at the same session where I upgraded to Advanced. We had filled out the 610 to indicate that she would change call signs, moving her from KB7xxx to N7xxx.

After the testing I was pleased to learn that she passed her upgrade, but not too happy to find out that one of the VEs came up to her and said "Do you really want to change your call sign? If you do that people will think you are a no-coder. You should keep the Novice call to prove you know code."

So not being real assertive, and figuring if it was this important to this stranger it must be important to everyone, she let him change her 610 to keep the same call.

She was not real happy when I explained that they would soon run out of N7xxx calls (which has now happened) and all those no-good no-coders would be getting the same KB7xxx calls she has. She would have preferred an N7xxx call as myself and our daughter has.

Well, a couple points to all this: Don't judge a license class by the call sign. In fact don't pay any attention to the license class at all -- see if the person has something interesting to talk about! (need only be interesting to you)

And a note to those of you that aren't hams and think that they all must be a bunch of jerks to carry on with all this nonsense -- I don't find the on-the-air hams to act anything like this. I find people on the air, both VHF and HF, to be quite nice and polite. Not 100%, but I can spin the dial on

the rig, and never have any problem whatever finding someone enjoyable to talk to. And on the repeater I hang out on I don't recall anyone concerned about code VS no-code. Maybe someplace, but fortunately not on "my repeater". (Not owned by me, just the one I use.) Our ham club contains a couple hundred members and no problem there about license class -- it is a club for hams -- everyone welcome. So if you aren't a ham, please don't consider usenet to be a true reflection of the hobby.

[This isn't meant to flame anyone making a previous post. Please don't think that, and if you do consider it a flame it is not directed to you, it is for that other guy, that idiot that didn't agree with your post.]

73, Dale

--

dale@sequent.com OR uunet!sequent!dale
Dale Mosby 503-578-9842 N7PEX // Sequent Computer Systems, Inc.
15450 SW Koll Parkway // Beaverton, Or. 97006-6063

Date: 15 Jul 93 01:00:14 GMT
From: topaz.bds.com!topaz.bds.com!ron@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Call sign snobbery
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> Right on, Dale!
> Except for the obviously superior KB0 2x2 calls. :-)

Or the near god-like status of the 4 character calls 0:-)
Still I support doing away with the code requirement, even though I don't think ill of people who would like to indulge themselves in it's pursuit. ...As long as they don't infringe in the one trully divine modulation mode ... 20 Meter AMTOR.

-Ron

Date: Wed, 14 Jul 93 17:51:38 GMT
From: mercury.hsi.com!a3bee2!cyphyn!randy@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Comments on CW issue.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

wjturner@iastate.edu (William J Turner) writes:

: Hello, everyone in net-land.
 :
 : I don't want this to turn into another edition in the on going flame-war,
 : but I felt I had to add my comments to the discussion on CW. I will try to
 : make them short.
 :
 : First of all, I do not believe in the high-speed morse code tests, and I am a
 : firm supporter of the no-code Technician. (I was one.) However, I do feel
 : that some morse code should be required for some licenses. Thats just my
 : opinion.
 :
 : Several people have commented on CW dieing. That may be the case, but I don't
 : see it that way. I see the CW portions of the bands (by that I mean the
 : non-phone portions since CW is legal everywhere) as being very active. Sure
 : there are people that can't send well, and so-called "scumbags", but there
 : always have been. As for CW needing to be protected, I really doubt it. When
 : I have worked SSB (rarely, though) I have noticed some CW being sent in the
 : same area of the band, and it can become *very* annoying. On the other hand,
 : when I have worked CW on the 40m band, and the Canadians or whoever are using
 : SSB on the same frequency, I find it much less of a problem for me. I would
 : venture to guess that if phone was allowed on all of the bands (thus
 : "un-protecting" CW) that it would actually be the users of phone that would be
 : hurt the most, and that the CWers would just keep on pounding away.
 :
 : This is just my opinion, and you can take it or leave it.
 :
 :
 : 73 es cul, Will
 :
 : --
 : Will Turner, NORDV -----
 : wjturner@iastate.edu | "Are you going to have any professionalism, |
 : twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu | or am I going to have to beat it into you?" |
 : TURNERW@vaxld.ameslab.gov -----

I'm inclined to feel the same way.
 The only issue to then worry about, 'harmful interference'...would an SSBer
 make an issue over it?
 I don't think so.
 I used to hang out close to 3700, and 1st started out on 3715 (rock bound).
 While on 3715, I'd hear SSB floating in as my QSO went along, but I too
 could still pull out my station. (don't ask me how) And I heard no gripes
 come back from the SSBerS.
 But, when I hung out on/close to 3700, I'd hear some odd CW, sounded like a
 vibroplex that was set up wrong, but was of non USA origine.
 Turned out to be some shore station calling ships on the calling freq. where
 after a long repeated sequence of very un-ham calls, he'd dissappear, then
 reappear up around 3708.

So, to not make 'harmful QRM' I'd wait out his awful cw (also had side tones beside the carrier...maybe was MCW?) before attempting a call.

Getting used to this back n forth business, as he'd stay put a while, I could get a qso thru, and be done before he came back.

I would say...for me...CW has an advantage....for those who just plain like it.

Randy , KA1UNW

Date: 14 Jul 93 14:51:29 GMT
From: psinntp!psinntp!arrl.org@RUTGERS.EDU
Subject: Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, system@garlic.sbs.com (Tony Pelliccio) writes:

>jbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom, KE3Z) writes:

>

>> *You* must be really naive if you think the FCC dances to the ARRL's tune.

>> The FCC does give weight to ARRL's input. And it should, since ARRL

>> represents 160k+ licensed amateurs. But I could cite numerous recent

>> rulings where the FCC did things differently--sometimes radically so--

>> from the way ARRL wanted them. I wish the FCC *did* listen more to the

>> ARRL.

>

>Whew.. they've got you totally blindfolded. Number one, the ARRL is

>constantly offering opinions to the FCC that are accepted and

>implemented by said agency. Secondly, the ARRL at my last accounting,

>only represents, or says the represent 120k- amateurs in the United

>States. And if you look at QST from a few years back, you'll see that

>the ARRL went AGAINST the membership in supporting the no-code license.

>Why is this? And please, don't use the argument of saving bandwidth. It

>wasn't that. How much money does the ARRL make everytime they sell my

>name to yet another distributor, or merchant? Hmmm... makes you wonder.

Well, the last thing I want to do is get into a flame war about this.

Suffice it to say, there isn't a word of truth in your above paragraph.

Your characterization of the ARRL's effect on the FCC is wrong, your

numbers are wrong, and your understanding of the history of the

no-code debate is wrong. Your knowledge of ARRL's sources of revenue

needs work, too.

>But, far be it from me to criticize the all mighty and powerful ARRL.

I'm delighted to hear criticism of ARRL--when it is founded on

knowledge and is well meant. I have little tolerance for the other

kind, which I suppose is a personal trait I need to improve.

Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbbloom@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League |
225 Main St., Newington CT 06111 |

Date: 14 Jul 93 18:42:55 GMT
From: parmesan.cs.wisc.edu!rcmolden@rsch.wisc.edu
Subject: Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Why don't the no coders just just the AARL and take it over? A critical mass of no coders would force the AARL to drop it's anti-no code bias.

Date: 14 Jul 93 15:42:32 GMT
From: psinntp!psinntp!arrl.org@RUTGERS.EDU
Subject: Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) writes:
[much deleted about getting youth involved]
>And no, we didn't rush out and pester our parents to buy us new commercial
>radios. We threw together godawful kludges from salvaged parts, or made do
>with old cast off equipment. I converted an old Motorola 5V for two meters,

Or, in many cases, borrowed equipment, a practice still alive and well.
My first transmitter was a local ham's homebrew 20-watt (I think) CW transmitter. That and a used HR-10 receiver (\$60 sticks in my mind as the price we paid, but I may be mistaken) got two budding hams (now-N1AL and me) on the air. (One also needs a large dose of parental tolerance of strange noises emanating from the "shack.") And my TS-520 has seen service in a half dozen new ham shacks over the years.

Unavailability of equipment is *not* the problem that keeps youth from flocking to ham radio. (Some of them have sneakers--excuse me, sports shoes--that cost as much as a used rig!)

Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbbloom@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League |
225 Main St., Newington CT 06111 |

Date: Wed, 14 Jul 93 15:41:14 GMT
From: mercury.hsi.com!a3bee2!cyphyn!randy@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Way too much to copy into here, so I start fresh!

After hearing all the jazz I have heard on the Gen. + bands , and hearing the various debates going on various groups, I asked myself 'why would I want to upgrade, and so get mixed in with all that?'....I may as well stay on the CW portions of the bands....for which I have liecence enough already to do.

A lot of what each one of you say is true / in part / in whole -- but it sure makes me wonder JUST what is Ham radio (now a days) ?

Starting as a Novice, the 1st band I got on was 80mtrs. Loved it ! Still do. And yes, I too have noticed a lot of non Ham stuff there.

Peer pressure DID push me to go to the trouble to go for the Tech test.... (25 silly questions...silly to me cuz they were TOO easy)....'trouble' meaning to arrange to get to the test site/ have papers in hand etc... The only real reason (then) for not going for the upgrade.

Soon after, this 'upgrade' felt more like a demotion! Several have already outlined why , in previous posts, so I won't echo it here.

NOW I hesitate to even consider further 'upgrade', and be where? and do what? OH! Be on 20 mtrs!

...and evryone read the previous posts, for why else....

NOT blaming any of you for anything, but the topics discussed hit the nail on the head,for why I have 2nd thoughts about upgrading...I may be just as well off to consider my self a Novice and set my dial accordingly.

Randy, KA1UNW

Date: 14 Jul 93 17:19:14 GMT
From: psinntp!psinntp!arrl.org@RUTGERS.EDU
Subject: Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, system@garlic.sbs.com (Tony Pelliccio) writes:

>jbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom, KE3Z) writes:

>> *You* must be really naive if you think the FCC dances to the ARRL's tune.
>> The FCC does give weight to ARRL's input. And it should, since ARRL

>> represents 160k+ licensed amateurs. But I could cite numerous recent
>> rulings where the FCC did things differently--sometimes radically so--
>> from the way ARRL wanted them. I wish the FCC *did* listen more to the
>> ARRL.

>Whew.. they've got you totally blindfolded. Number one, the ARRL is
>constantly offering opinions to the FCC that are accepted and
>implemented by said agency.

I certainly hope so. Can I infer from your statement that if all of our
opinions were rejected by the FCC you would be heaping praise upon us?

>How much money does the ARRL make everytime they sell my
>name to yet another distributor, or merchant? Hmmm... makes you wonder.

I'm not too sure what this has to do with our no-code position, but I
will point out that there is a box you can check on your membership
application that will ensure that we do not provide your name and address
to dealers, QSL card companies, etc. However, I suspect that most of
our members do not mind getting these mailings.

>The other thing that bothers me about the ARRL is they constantly stick
>their nose into things they have no bearing upon. For instance, the
>broadcast radio obscenity hearings are a good example.

I think that our comments on this issue were very much related to
Amateur Radio. Our reasoning is that if obscenity is allowed on
the public broadcast bands then this will significantly undermine our
efforts to get more FCC enforcement against some of the profanity
and obscenity present on the amateur bands. Not all hams will agree,
but I suspect that we are on pretty safe ground believing that most
hams (and ARRL members) support our efforts in this direction.

>But, far be it from me to criticize the all mighty and powerful ARRL.

You just did, but we really do want to hear the opinions of people who
do not believe that we are doing a good job in one or more areas. Most
people who do not agree with our actions and policies do not take the
time to contact the appropriate people in the ARRL. Contact your Division
Director about ARRL policy matters, your Section Manager for the Field
activities in your section, and the appropriate HQ staff or management
for things about the HQ operation. (See page 8 of QST, the QST masthead,
or get the appropriate files from info@arrl.org).

BTW, I am not too sure why you chose the term "all-mighty and powerful"
for ARRL. Usually the use of emotive words and sarcasm undermine rather
than support an idea.

>to use it to justify future decisions.

Is it worth it? That is really Todd's decision, but in either case, it is far better to create the paper trail (evidence) that might be needed for an appeal, than to not do it and regret later.

As to the NQOI decision. I believe that is only precedent in the federal court district where it was decided. Other federal court districts MAY use it as they see fit, but they are not bound by it, and it is still possible for it to be overturned at the Supreme Court level if it is appealed there.

As an aside, you should see the hysteria going on here in the northeast with the placement of cellular antenna sites (and remember we are only talking relatively low power for the cell site transmitters as compared to the possible 1500 PEP power of a ham station)

>As an ARRL Local Government Liason, who do you report to ?

The LGL position is fairly new, having been created here in the Northern New Jersey division as the brainchild of Rich Moseson NW2L. The LGL position essentially reports to the division director.

> Isn't it time we
>made some noise to our division directors, as well as the ARRL Executive
>VP, Dave Sumner, K1ZZ. How are we gonna shake these bureaucrats off their
>bureacratc butts ?

One thing needed is a larger number of LGL's. Many divisions have none at all. What may be needed is a QST article describing what the LGL's purpose is (essentially to help as best as possible in cases of zoning and ordinance problems).

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

Date: 14 Jul 93 15:51:13 GMT
From: psinntp!psinntp!newsserver.pixel.kodak.com!wpd@RUTGERS.EDU
Subject: The Canonical list of Code-Wars Answers
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

William J Turner (wjturner@iastate.edu) wrote:
: In article <930713.020025.7W9.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>
system@garlic.sbs.com (Tony Pelliccio) writes:
: >brian@amdcl2.amd.com (Brian McMinn N5PSS) writes:

: >> 30) Hams who started with No-Code now represent 98% of all hams!
: >
: >Could be, but lots of them upgraded because we didn't like our N#XXX
: >calls. :)

: What about us who upgraded and kept our N#XXX calls?

You couldn't pay me to change my call sign!

--

Bill DeMatties | Electricity is actually made up of extremely tiny
N2USA | particles, called electrons, that you cannot see
wpd@raster.kodak.com | with the naked eye unless you have been drinking.

Date: Wed, 14 Jul 93 16:51:23 GMT
From: mercury.hsi.com!a3bee2!cyphyn!randy@uunet.uu.net
Subject: The FCC
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

floyd@nraven.wariat.org (Douglas Dever) writes:

: Somewhere I remember reading that the Amateur Service was
: self-policeing. Now, I may have been terribly mistaken, but I don't
: think so. However, it is true that someone definatly needs to light a
: flame under the FCC's backside, but look at it from their point of few.
: Our licenses are free.. we're not giving them anything... why should they
: give anything to us?

(stuff deleted to save space only)

:
: Oh well... maybe it's just time we tried to be good amateurs again, and
: went after those who refuse to be.
:
: 73 de N8VUR
:
: --
: __ Douglas A. Dever __ Floyd@nraven.wariat.org
: QSO on 146.82/R Anytime!

First, in a previous artical it was very clearly out lined WHY the FCC is not doing this and that...in essence, they lack the funds to pay for field personnel to do the job.

The FCC is BROKE! The flame needs to be applied elsewhere.

Second...'went after those who refuse to be'....

After finding the offenders, exactly what can one do? Somthing that WORKS I mean.

WE can't 'go after' someone. They'd not listen to us in too many cases, and all it would do is give them an RST report, delivered in person.

We can't go confiscate their gear...thats theft.

We can't disable their gear (oh like 'pin coax') ... thats property damage. We can't call the police on them...they have no jurisdiction.

All we can do is 'stake out' the offender at a distance (stalking laws!) like from yer own home....and log each time, date frequency, content of message, and beam heading,you get , when they do it. When you have a large pile of paper collected, contact the nearest Official Observrer and follow his directions. (Also zerox your log, just in case)

So becarful about saying ' going after these people'

Third....RIGHT ON.....to be good hams

The recipe for that is spelled out in any ARRL Handbook, find

The Amateurs Code (not the CW kind)

Randy, KA1UNW

Date: Wed, 14 Jul 1993 19:07:33 GMT

From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!Csl!

paulf@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul13.163752.28300@ke4zv.uucp>, <CA59vu.GJp@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <1993Jul14.130047.3228@ke4zv.uucp>

Subject : Re: Brilliant postings

In <1993Jul14.130047.3228@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) writes:

>If you poke your nose into HRO as often as I do, you notice that there
>is a rapid turnover of VHF/UHF equipment, particularly HTs, but that
>the sales of HF gear is much less. That despite the higher margins
>involved in them. And the poor sad code keys seem to have a heavy
>layer of dust in their cabinet. More striking perhaps is the used
>shelf at The Ham Station. They can't keep good VHF/UHF gear on the
>shelf, but they have HF equipment that's languished there for over
>a year. Ask a used car dealer what it means when something sound
>sits on the lot that long.

There are several factors in favor of a larger turnover in VHF/UHF equipment. The first is the much larger user population, by a factor of at least three. The second is cost; the typical used handheld goes for about one third of the cost of a typical used HF transceiver. Finally, there's the fact that the manufacturers turn over their VHF/UHF lines much more frequently than for HF. Not to mention the fact that until recently, you needed an HT for each band, but only one HF rig.

I'm sorry Gary, but your statements about the light use of CW on HF simply are not borne out in my experience. On 20, the number of CW QSOs is about the same as for SSB every time I've checked, and the number of CW QSOs on 40 generally exceeds the SSB QSOs.

I also don't agree with your speculations about CW usage dying off. The club in which I participate (Stanford ARC, W6YX) has 42 members, 35 of whom are General or above. Of those, 19 are primarily CW ops, with the rest putting in a few hours now and then during contests. And, oh yeah, the average member age is under 30. Go figure.

--

--Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #229
